



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a universal truth—the necessary greatness of Rome, or the fore-ordained fate of mankind. The question, therefore, arises whether it would not be simpler and better to say merely that the drama tends to be logical, while the epic contains a large element of faith or assumption than to try to distribute the forms among time-categories.

On the whole, it seems obvious that the fundamental distinctions between the kinds of poetry must be distinctions of function or purpose. And it appears, at once, a trifle absurd to say that the *purpose* or *function* of epic poetry is to point toward the future, or that the human need satisfied by the drama is the need of reflecting upon the past.

The remaining essays treat of the teaching of poetry, the "new poetry," and the relation of scholarship to poetry. They are characterized by a fine mingling of discrimination and common sense. Professor Erskine is wise in requiring some sort of real definition of poetry and of its *genres*, and in not being satisfied with a mere historical account. He is wise in attempting to make the definition broad enough to correspond with real human instincts. His breadth of view, his refusal to rest content with mere special scholarship, gives value to his advice about the teaching of poetry. "Instead of teaching poetry as philosophy or literature," he writes, "we need to draw on history and philosophy in order to understand poetry." Looking at the new poetry from much the same angle, he points out acutely the relation between all poetry and a broad and humane scholarship.

"When the language of poetry was developing toward the hope of complete communication between man and man, the confession that you did not quite understand him would have worried the poet. Nowadays the confession only indicates to him that you do not move in this world." The criticism is fundamental.

THE COLLEGE AND NEW AMERICA. By Jay Williams Hudson, Ph. D., New York: D. Appleton and Company.

When will men generally come to realize that *abstractions* are practical things? The fact has a two-fold meaning: It means that abstractions are of no use in themselves, and that they *are* of use as means to ends. The academic mind tends to regard its own abstractions as having intrinsic value and truth, and to ignore the more vaguely conceived, but absolutely essential human notions of worth: it is guilty of "hypostasis of function." The ordinary mind tends to reject abstractions as having no direct connection with its ideas of value and practical truth. Thus life and learning grow apart and it is possible for Veblen to maintain that they have not now, and never have had, any necessary interdependence, the higher learning being motivated solely by "idle curiosity."

Of course, the solution of the difficulty does not lie in making learning subservient to immediate practical ends, in shackling education with vocational restrictions. To do so would be to stultify the teacher and to discourage in the pupil that intellectual curiosity which, in any view, is of value. The real problem is to discover an ideal of

worth that shall include scholarship, since scholarship can neither include our ideal of worth nor be safely substituted for it.

To find such an ideal is not easy, because learning does not readily submit to a process that subordinates it to other aims. "Higher" knowledge is generally brought to light by men who seek it for its own sake, and is seldom really understood except by those who study it for its own sake. If we ask what made Newton discover the law of gravitation, or urged Darwin to formulate the theory of evolution, or Morse to invent the telegraph, the answer must be that, while these men were well disposed toward mankind, their primary motive was not anything like philanthropy or good-citizenship, but rather a passionate interest in their special subjects.

Let us be content, however, with the rejoinder that the college is not intended for the *genius*, and that there is little danger of thwarting the intellectual enthusiasms of the few by establishing an educational system really conceived in the best interests of the many. "Education," says Dr. Hudson, "is the teaching of right wants and of how to get them," and the formula is acceptable. The exercise of a special talent *may* be a right want, but it is not *the* right want.

That some change of policy on the part of the colleges is desirable becomes more and more evident, as the young men and women of this country crowd into our class-rooms in ever-increasing numbers. The pure-scholarship ideal, which never appealed to more than a moderate percentage of undergraduates, tends now to become grotesquely irrelevant as applied to large numbers. Dr. Hudson has analyzed the condition with uncommon penetration. His criticism of American college education is at once sensible and radical. "The college graduate attains not only one, but two great modern abstractions: not only the abstraction of subjects from one another, but the abstraction of all of them from life." Little or nothing is done to correct these unfortunate separations. "We may have one reason for including mathematics among the things the student must master; and another, perhaps a wholly contradictory reason, for including political science; but no one reason or ideal that might create a unified curriculum." Finally, to express the severest and least answerable criticism in a nutshell: "Perhaps there is only one thing worse than that the college student should forget his subjects; and that is that he should remember them. For to remember them is most often to go into life confidently solving its problems with abstractions that do not fit."

In thus formulating the educational problem of the colleges, Dr. Hudson has performed a real service such as one could scarcely expect from any one but a practical-minded philosopher, at home alike with realities and with abstractions. It is almost an inevitable criticism, however, of any such attempt at analytical plus constructive thinking that the constructive part is not equal to the analytical. Dr. Hudson's remedies are not so convincing as his criticism.

There can be no quarrel with the suggestion that "the aim of American education is to produce a definite American social order, in relation to a definite world order." The proposed ideal, it is well said, is "not too narrow, as the utility of vocationalism; nor too broad and vague, as the familiar slogan of 'education for character' or 'edu-

cation for social service' or 'education for democracy'—vagaries in terms of which most well-intentioned reforms in education have been damned." No one who understands this ideal will consider it too narrow, and if it seems, on slight consideration, a trifle vague, one may defend it, first, by saying that Dr. Hudson does succeed in making it fairly definite, and, secondly, by calling attention to the fact that every true ideal becomes clearer as we approach it—the main thing being to start in the right direction.

It is only when one considers the practical working out of the theory, the means to be employed, that one becomes skeptical. When one thinks what is implied in the (ultimate) rewriting of text-books and in the giving of thorough and comprehensive correlation courses through the co-operation of several departments, one is somewhat disheartened. When one reflects upon how little is likely to be accomplished by correlation courses that are merely added to the special courses—the latter remaining, as they are now, the core of the curriculum; and upon the probably slight effect of further tinkering with the group system of electives, or of teaching ethics in a somewhat more vital way, one is not encouraged.

Every special subject probably leaves in the mind of the student a residuum of knowledge that is of general use, that can be readily correlated with other knowledge, be made to serve a general ideal, be transmuted into wisdom. As civilization advances, this residuum tends to become larger; yet it must always remain relatively small. May it not be, then, that anything like advanced instruction (such as colleges profess to give) in special subjects, is *incurably special*; that education and "life" do necessarily tend to part company at about the high-school stage, and that the only way in which to obtain that broader education toward a worthy life which Dr. Hudson wants is *to live*?

If this be true, then, granting the truth of Dr. Hudson's criticism, one might conclude that the real trouble with the colleges is that they are trying to teach too much, and to teach it—not, indeed, too *thoroughly*—but too *minutely*. And the corollary would be that if the high-schools and preparatory schools would do what Dr. Hudson says the colleges ought to do, the colleges would be relieved of the dubious task of making special and advanced subjects, numerous and varied, serve the ends of "general education."

THE VOICE OF THE NEGRO. By Robert T. Kerlin. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company.

The collection of extracts which Professor Kerlin has taken from the colored press to form his volume, expresses the negro's views on a great variety of subjects. Some of the principal topics under which the excerpts are grouped are the new negro and the old, the negro's reaction to the World War, the negro's grievances and demands, riots, lynchings, labor unionism and Bolshevism, negro progress. The clippings cover the four months immediately succeeding the Washington riots; they are designed especially to show the negro's reaction to that and like events following, and to the World War.